REMARKS

The comments of the applicant below are each preceded by related comments of the examiner (in small, bold type).

Double Patenting

Claims 7-13 of this application conflict with claims 8-14 of Application No. 10/826711, respectively. 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. Applicant is required to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822.

Claim 7 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 8 of copending Application No. 10/826,711.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claim 7 of this instant application	Claim 8 of the application 10/826, 711
A machine-based method comprising in connection with a project based on historical data about a system being modeled, generating a predictive model, and portraying to a user through a graphical user interface a sequence of dimension reduction having two or more steps.	A machine-based method comprising in connection with a project in which a user generates a predictive model based on historical data about a system being modeled, providing to the user through a graphical user interface a structured sequence of model generation activities to be followed, the sequence including sample dataset generation, variable transformation, dimension reduction, model generation, model process validation, model re-generation, and list scoring

Note the comparisons above, respectively Claim 7 of the instant application are not patentably distinct from claim 8 of the application 10/826,711 because as shown from the table above claim 8 of application 10/826,711 fully shows the limitations of claim 7 of the instant application. For example, claim 7 of the instant application is broader in scope and does not mention a number of limitations such as "model process validation, model re-generation, and list scoring" as recited in claim 8 of the application 10/826,711. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have claim 7 of the instant application be clearly shown by claim 8 of application 10/826,711.

The applicant disagrees with the examiner's position but may file a terminal disclaimer depending on the future course of the prosecution in light of the current amendments.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bounsaythip and Rinta-Runsala "Overview of Data Mining for Customer

Behavior Modeling" -Finland: VTT Information Technology, Research Report TTEI -18, 2001 (hereinafter "Bounsaythip").

As to independent claim 1, Bounsaythip discloses a machine-based method comprising receiving historical (see Page 7, Figure 3) multi-dimensional data representing multiple variables (e.g., multi-dimensional) (see Page 13, Section 3.3.1 Definition; and Page 44, Checkpoint 5), transforming variables into more predictive variables (e.g., predictive model) (see Page 8, Section 2.4.1 Data sampling), including Bayesian renormalized variables (see Page 32, Section 3.8 Other data mining methods), linearly transformed and non-linearly transformed variables and imputed missing values for categorical or continuous variables (e.g., classification and regression) (see Page 11, Classification and Regression), pruning variables for which the data is sparse or missing (e.g., pruning) (see Page 19, Section 3.5.2 Tree induction), adjusting a population of variables to represent main effects exhibited by the data and significant interaction and non-linear effects exhibited by the data (e.g., data mining to visualize non-linear interaction of variables) (see Page 10, First two I Paragraphs), and using the adjusted population of variables to generate a predictive $_1$ model for interacting with a commercial system (e.g., build the model to predict) (see Page 7, Section 2.4 Model building).

The applicant disagrees. Claim 1 recites transforming variables into more predictive variables that include Bayesian renormalized variables, linearly transformed and non-linearly transformed variables and imputed missing values for categorical or continuous variables.

Bounsaythip does not describe and would not have made obvious the features of claim 1. Although Bounsaythip does describe data mining using clustering, classification and regression, or association rule discovery and sequential pattern discovery (see, e.g., Bounsaythip, page 10), Bounsaythip does not describe and would not have made obvious, for example, transforming variables into more predicative variables that include Bayesian renormalized variables.

In rejecting claim 1, the examiner pointed to the Bayesian belief networks described on page 32 of Bounsaythip as anticipating the Bayesian renormalized variables recited in claim 1. However, Bayesian belief networks, according to Bounsaythip, are a model for representing uncertainty in a certain domain and have nothing to do with Bayesian renormalization of variables.

As to independent claim 7, Bounsaythip discloses a machine-based method comprising in connection with a project based on historical data about a system being modeled (see Page 7, Figure 3), generating a predictive model (e.g., build the model to predict) (see Page 7, Section 2.4 Model building), and portraying to a user through a graphical user interface a sequence of dimension reduction having two or more steps (e.g., dimension reduction) (see Page 6, Last Paragraph continuing to Page 7).

Claim 7 recites providing to a user through a graphical user interface a sequence of dimension reduction having at least two or more steps.

Bounsaythip does not describe and would not have made obvious the features of claim 7. Although Bounsaythip describes dimension reduction in data preparation for modeling (see, e.g., Id., pages 6-7), Bounsaythip does not describe and would not have made obvious that his dimension reduction includes at least two or more steps. Nor does Bounsaythip describe and would not have made obvious providing a sequence of dimension reduction having at least two or more steps to a user through a graphical user interface. In fact, Bounsaythip is silent on both "providing the sequence of dimension reduction" "to a user" and "through a graphical user interface".

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least similar reasons as those for the claims on which they depend are patentable .

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

The fee in the amount of $525 for the Petition for Extension of Time fee is being paid on the electronic filing system by way of deposit account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing attorney docket 17146-005001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/12/8

David L. Feigenbaum
Reg. No. 30,378

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21812060.doc